

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 remain pending in the application. Claims 2 and 10 have been cancelled; and Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Figures 9 and 10 are objected to because they should be designated by a legend such as – Prior Art – because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

The drawings have been amended to overcome the objection.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The specification is objected to because of certain informalities.

The disclosure has been amended to overcome the objections.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sato** (U.S. Pat. No. 5,055,027) in view of **Meyer** (U.S. Pat. No. 4,136,969). **Claims 8 and 15 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sato** in view of **Meyer** as applied to Claims 1-7 and 9-14, and further in view of **Murata et al.** (U.S. Pat. No. 5,980,227). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2, and Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 10. Independent claims 1 and 9 relate to an extrusion molding apparatus in which the pressure portion has a feed rate per revolution which progressively decreases toward the forward end extrusion port, and the extended portion has a feed rate per revolution which progressively increases toward the forward end extrusion port, whereby the ceramic material to which pressure has been applied in the pressure portion can be smoothly led toward the forward end extrusion port.

On the other hand, **Sato** and **Meyer** fail to teach the feature:

the pressure portion has a feed rate per revolution which progressively decreases toward the forward end extrusion port, and the extended portion has a feed rate per revolution which progressively increases toward the forward end extrusion port.

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 13, 2003

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt
Reg. No. 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/lf-s

G:\mschmidt\IPICS = DENSO (4041)\000068.K\Amendment 08.13.03\Amendment.doc

Although the Examiner states that **Meyer** discloses the constituent features in Figure 2, there is no description of such features in the specification; and, therefore, Applicants believe that **Meyer** fails to teach a technical idea of the invention.

The Examiner's statement is based on merely Figure 2, which does not refer to the feed rate per revolution. However, a person skilled in the art cannot read the technical idea of the invention based on Figure 2, since the figures attached to the specification are schematic views and do not show accurate dimensions of a structure. Accordingly, **Meyer** fails to teach the features or the technical idea of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 9, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3-8 and 10-15, which ultimately depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the